UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,573	06/26/2003	Todd Karakashian	ORACL-01282US1	4687

80548   7590   08/28/2008
Fliesler Meyer LLP
650 California Street
14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108

EXAMINER
SHAW, PELING ANDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2144	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/606,573	KARAKASHIAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	PELING A. SHAW	2144	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 July 2008</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
     closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

     1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

     2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

     3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
          application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/27/08,7/24/08</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/27/2008 has been entered. Claims 1, 11 and

20-23 are amended. Claim 24 is new. Claims 1-24 are currently pending.

2.   Amendment received on 08/31/2007 was entered into record. Claims 1-12, 14-16 and 20

were amended. Claims 21-23 were new.

Priority

3.   This application is a CIP of 10/366,236 filed on 02/13/2003 which claims benefit of

60/359,098 filed on 02/22/2002 and claims benefit of 60/392,217 filed on 06/27/2002. The filing

date is 06/26/2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section
122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent
or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States
before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed
under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application
designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the
English language.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Amirisetty et al. (US

7152090 B2), hereinafter referred as Amirisetty.

   a. Regarding claim 1, Amirisetty disclosed a storage medium including software system

       applications for providing access to web services (column 1, lines 52-56: J2EE CA),

       comprising: a container driver that accepts invoke request for a web service from a

       client (column 1, lines 60-62: CCI; column 5, lines 54-61: invoke through J2EE CA

       connector), an interceptor that receives initial message context for the invoke request

       for the web service from said container driver, the initial message context including a

       plurality of parts each of which includes corresponding content, and modifies the

       content of one or more of the parts of the initial message context to produce modified

       message context for the web service, the modified message context including the

       same plurality of parts as the initial message context but with the content of one or

       more parts differing from the initial message context (column 4, lines 26-58: map

       high-level XML dialect to action flow of connector-level invocations and result

tertiary results to yield an output object to be returned, input and results data objects;

column 6, lines 8-18: modify metadata content; column 6, lines 52-62: unified

representation of interaction specification, in memory representations of records;

column 11, lines 42: XML DTD for high-level function definitions, input and output

type definition, sequence of input/out transformation, initializers for secondary data

objects; column 12, lines 1-20: consume XML schema/DTD definitions and generate

components/classes for runtime use by XML content type handlers; column 12, lines

56-67: handlers require runtime component derived from input/output type

definitions; column 13, lines 13-25: return result as playload in the response message

of the service request; column 14, lines 10-30: ejbmethod; in light of applicant's

paragraph 27 of specification; Fig. 7, column 15, lines 19-41: MIME/mullti-part-

message ServiceExecute, create XML record out of payload, execute using

interaction application and XML record, take the output XML record and populate

outgoing MIME/multi-part-message; column 15, line 55 through column 16, line 45:

flowchart illustrating using a metadata-aware Enterprise Application Integration built

on top of adaptor/connector for external system interface and data object transformed

from business XML to XML protocol); and an invocation handler that receives the

modified message context from said container driver, passes parameters from the

modified message context to the target of the request, processes values returned from

the target, and passes the values to the container driver, such that the container driver

can formulate a response to the invoke request (Fig. 4; column 6, line 63-column 7,

line 17: high-level function invoke low-level calls in sequence through connector;

column 8, lines 10-21: sequence of low-level function calls perform high-level

function and return results).

b. Regarding claim 2, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1 wherein the

client utilizes JAX-RPC to invoke the web services (Fig. 3; column 13, lines 13-25:

server wrapper receives JAX-RPC).

c. Regarding claim 3, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1 wherein said

container driver is adapted to perform any data binding and unbinding required to

process the invoke request (column 12, lines 12-20 and 44-55: JAXB).

d. Regarding claim 4, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1, further

comprising a protocol adapter that intercepts web service invoke requests and passes

the web service invoke requests to said container driver (column 9, lines 14-20: CCI

adaptor provide a unified representation; lines 44-46: see Business XML; column 10,

lines 30-35: convert Business XML to protocol XML).

e. Regarding claim 5, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 4, wherein said

protocol adapter converts the format of an invoke request and create a message

context containing the invoke request (column 9, lines 14-20: CCI adaptor provide a

unified representation; lines 44-46: see Business XML; column 10, lines 30-35:

convert Business XML to protocol XML).

f. Regarding claim 6, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1, further

comprising a plugin component to be used by said container driver to perform any

data binding and unbinding (column 10, lines 30-42: pluggable JAXB).

g. Regarding claim 7, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1, further
comprising an invocation context for storing arbitrary context data useful in
processing the web request, said invocation context available to at least one of said
interceptor and said invocation handler (column 11, lines 27-35: metadata stored in
metadata repository).

h. Regarding claim 8, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1, wherein said
invocation handler manages security policies, transaction management, and target
object life cycle for the request (column 1, lines 52-60: managing resource pooling,
transactions and security).

i. Regarding claim 9, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1, further
comprising a web service container for hosting said container driver, said interceptor,
and said invocation handler (column 1, lines 52-60: J2EE CA in Web/Application
server).

j. Regarding claim 10, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1, further
comprising a target object to which said invocation handler can delegate processing
the invoke request (column 13, lines 13-25: request payload as input to target
function).

k. Claim 11 and 20 are of the same scope as claim 1. These are rejected for the same
reasons as for claim 1.

l. Claims 12-19 are of the same scope as claims 1-5 and 7-10. These are rejected for the
same reasons as for claims 1-5 and 7-10.

m. Regarding claim 21, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1, wherein the plurality of parts for the initial message context and the plurality of parts for the modified message context each include a request message and a response message with a difference between the initial message context and the modified message context being the content of one or more of these parts (column 4, lines 26-58: map high-level XML dialect to action flow of connector-level invocations and result tertiary results to yield an output object to be returned, input and results data objects; column 6, lines 52-62: unified representation of interaction specification, in memory representations of records; column 11, lines 42: XML DTD for high-level function definitions, input and output type definition, sequence of input/out transformation, initializers for secondary data objects; column 12, lines 56-67: handlers require runtime component derived from input/output type definitions; column 13, lines 13-25: return result as playload in the response message of the service request; column 14, lines 10-30: ejbmethod; Fig. 6, column 14, line 62-column 15, line 4: Business XML, transformation and return).

n. Regarding claim 22, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 7, wherein the content of the invocation context component includes at one of the following: a conversation ID; a message sequence number; and a security token (column 3, lines 29-56: a framework consisting of a sequence of low-level calls to guarantee sequence/order; column 8, lines 47-62: metadata repository includes the definitions of connection specifications; column 9, lines 11-19: declarative transactional and security features; column 11, lines 42-67: security constraints attributes of data

source; column 15, lines 20-41: read the property set to determine the connector to

talk to, the connection specification and the caller identity).

o. Claim 23 is of the same scope as claim 1. It is rejected for the same reasons as for

claim 1.

p. Regarding claim 24, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1, wherein the

initial message context and the modified message context each include transport

information, wherein the transport information comprises information specific to the

transport over which the request came, and over which the response is sent (column 8,

lines 47-62: metadata repository includes the definitions of connection specifications;

column 9, lines 20-29: accessible using various protocols, such as HTTP, HTTPS,

etc.; column 10, lines 43-67: service provider interface defined as a set of interfaces

representing connector interaction with the application server; column 14, lines 10-

30: ejbmethod, get connection; column 15, lines 20-41: read the property set to

determine the connector to talk to, the connection specification and the caller

identity).

Amirisetty disclosed all limitations of claims 1-24. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

102(e).

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed on 06/27/2008 have been fully considered, but they are not

persuasive.

a.   Applicant has amended the claim with minor changes from the term of "component"

to "part" and has separated the limitation on "transport information" from claim 21 to

claim 24. Applicant has further cited sections from applicant's specification in

support the previous and current amendment. Examiner has reviewed the amendment

in light of the cited references and would accept the amendment as it is now.

b.   Examiner has further performed a search based upon the amended limitations with

respect the claim as whole. It seems that Amirisetty has all the limitations, including

the limitation on transporting information. Claim rejections are updated to reflect the

current amendment and identified references from Amirisetty.

c.   Applicant argues (2nd paragraph on page 10 of current amendment) that Amirisetty

will clearly not have same plurality of parts as the initial message context. As

applicant has cited sections from applicant's original specification in support the

amended limitation of "plurality of parts". Examiner has reviewed these cited

sections. Examiner has further searched and found Amirisetty that does teach and/or

suggest the claimed invention including applicant's amended limitation of "plurality

of parts" in light of applicant's specification. The claim rejections above are updated

with further extensive references from Amirisetty.

d.   It is examiner's position that Amirisetty discloses all claimed limitations in the same

scope as applicant's specification and applicant has not submitted claims drawn to

limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed

invention in manner, which distinguishes over the prior art. As it is Applicant's right

to claim as broadly as possible their invention, it is also the Examiner's right to

interpret the claim language as broadly as possible. It is the Examiner's position that

the detailed functionality that allows for Applicant's invention to overcome the prior

art used in the rejection, fails to differentiate in detail how these features are unique

(see item a in section 4). Amirisetty has shown that a metadata-aware Enterprise

Application Integration (EAI) framework for an application server environment

allows the connector writer to connect to a system using a low-level API; provides a

space in a connector where the user can define high-level functions; using the

framework, the user can mine the metadata for the functions and generate a

description of the high-level function which can then be dropped into the framework

and appear as a high-level function, invokable through the connector, to the

developer; invoking and driving the low-level API provided by the connector. It is

clear that Applicant must be able to submit claim language to distinguish over the

prior arts used in the above rejection sections that discloses distinctive features of

Applicant's claimed invention. It is suggested that Applicant compare the original

specification and claim language with the cited prior art used in the rejection section

above or the Remark section below to draw an amended claim set to further the

prosecution.

e. Failure for Applicant to narrow the definition/scope of the claims and supply

arguments commensurate in scope with the claims implies the Applicant's intent to

broaden claimed invention. Examiner interprets the claim language in a scope

parallel to the Applicant in the response. Examiner reiterates the need for the

Applicant to more clearly and distinctly define the claimed invention.

Remarks

6.   The following pertaining arts are discovered and not used in this office action. Office

reserves the right to use these arts in later actions.

     a.   Banerjee et al. (US 20030131049 A1) Internationalization of the web services

        infrastructure

     b.   Baller et al. (US 20030118353 A1) Method and apparatus for managing intelligent

        assets in a distributed environment

     c.   Brown et al. (US 20030110242 A1) Method and apparatus for dynamic

        reconfiguration of web services infrastructure

     d.   Brittenham et al. (US 20020178254 A1) Dynamic deployment of services in a

        computing network

     e.   Humpleman et al. (US 6466971 B1) Method and system for device to device

        command and control in a network: web service

     f.   Faccin et al. (US 20020120729 A1) Internet protocol based service architecture

     g.   Merrick et al. (US 7028312 B1) XML remote procedure call (XML-RPC)

     h.   Kruy et al. (US 7406523 B1) Client-server communications system and method using

        a semi-connectionless protocol

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. Refer to the enclosed PTO-892 for details.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Peling A. Shaw whose telephone number is (571) 272-7968. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, William C. Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the statu9s of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Peling A Shaw/
Examiner, Art Unit 2144